

**From:** [MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [ROICK Tom](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** FW: GW Seeps  
**Date:** 08/28/2006 11:20 AM

---

Eric,

Based on Tom's comments below it looks like the LWG should include Outfall 22B in the list seeps.

Also, NW Natural recently submitted a data report on Doane Creek/22C outfall. It looks like we continue to see low level exceedances of JSCS SLVs at the outfall. Because of the dry weather flow, it is likely that groundwater is a significant contributor to the contaminant load.

Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: ROICK Tom  
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2006 11:00 AM  
To: MCCLINCY Matt  
Subject: RE: GW Seeps

Matt,

22B should be included and is more of a concern than 22C at this point.

22B intersects RPAC's groundwater plume, contaminated groundwater infiltrates the storm line and discharges at the bank to the River (south of the BNSF railroad bridge). In line sediments may represent past releases from Gould before the Gould remedy was implemented. At the river bank the pipe is above groundwater, but it acts as a preferential pathway due to infiltration further back (upland) along Front Ave. The pipe discharges to soil on the bank and flows across the beach to the river. The groundwater infiltration issue and remaining inline sediments has been identified by SLLI for an interim source control measure which will be implemented pending City permits, possibly this fall. That discharges may have impacted soil/sediment on the beach hasn't been investigated/addressed by SLLI. Follow-up sampling on the beach may be appropriate after the interim action is completed.

22C receives North Doane Lake discharge, Doane Creek (Koppers) discharge, and possibly groundwater infiltration, but water samples collected by SLLI at the 22C outfall have been below SLVs. 22C does discharge onto the beach (north of the BNSF railroad bridge).

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: MCCLINCY Matt  
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2006 4:08 PM  
To: ROICK Tom  
Subject: FW: GW Seeps

Tom,

Can you help out on the 22B question? Does it daylight and flow across the beach? If so are the COI/COCs are levels of potential concern?

Thanks Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: [Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov)  
[mailto:[Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov)]  
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2006 12:48 PM  
To: ANDERSON Jim M; MCCLINCY Matt  
Cc: [Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov)  
Subject: GW Seeps

In the draft issue summary table, EPA identified the following groundwater seeps as requiring evaluation in the ERA: Exxon Mobil, Outfall 22C, Brix Maritime and Gunderson Areas 2 and 3. I just got a call from Dawn Sanders who wondered if we meant Outfall 22B instead of 22C. The list I had came from an email from Matt on September 6, 2005. What about 22B? I know that this has been an issue because of RPAC contaminants (and possibly Gould?). Should this be included as well?

Eric